

Remarks

Claims 17 - 22 and 24 - 31 are pending. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 25 and 27 have been noted as substantial duplicates. Applicants have amended claim 27 to be dependent upon claim 17, and thus these claims are no longer equivalent. Applicants' attorney apologizes for this error in presenting the new claims in the prior, Preliminary Amendment.

The specification has been objected to (page 7, line 10) for the use of the term "0.5 C₈H₁₂." Claims 17, 23, and 31 have been rejected for the use of this same term in claim 17. The use of this phrase is well known to those skilled in the art, and refers to cyclooctadiene ("COD") (C₈H₁₂) π -bonded to Rhodium at one of the two double bonds of COD, *i.e.* to "0.5" of the total π -bonding unsaturation. Thus, in the formula Rh₂X₂Y₄ where Y = 0.5 COD, and where X=Cl, the formula of the catalyst will be Rh₂Cl₂(COD)₂, or [RhCl(COD)]₂ where each Rhodium atom is coordinated with 2 double bonds derived from COD moieties, *i.e.* 2 (0.5 COD). Such compounds are well known, and are disclosed, for example, in "Syntheses and Characterization of Upper Rim 1,2- and 1,3-Diphosphinated Calix[4]arenes and their corresponding 1,5-Cyclooctadienylrhodium (I) complexes: Characterization of the Catalytic Hydroformylation Properties of Terminal Alkenes," F. Plourde, et al., ORGANOMETALLICS, 2003 (Web cite: www.callisto.si.usherb.ca:8080/pharvey/Calix4arene/papier113.pdf). Applicants submit that to one skilled in the art of π -complexes of transition metals, the terminology used is definite. If the Examiner wishes, Applicants will agree to replace the "OY₄" and "0.5 C₈H₁₂" with [C₈H₁₂]₂ with the understanding that the bonding between Rh and the COD moiety is π bonding. However, Applicants believe the specification and claims to be clear and definite as presently drafted, and respectfully request withdrawal of the objection to the disclosure and the rejection of claim 17, 23, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶2.

Claims 16, 21 - 22, and 28 - 30 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Claim 16 has been cancelled, and the dependencies of claims 21, 22, and 28 - 30 have been amended to depend directly or indirectly from claim 17. Withdrawal of the rejection of pending claims 21, 22, and 28 - 30 is solicited.

Claims 18 - 20 and 24 - 27 have been objected to as depending from a rejected base claim, but otherwise indicated as allowable. These claims have been amended to be dependent upon claim 17, either directly or indirectly. Withdrawal of the objection to these claims is solicited.


Claims 17, 23, and 31 have been indicated as allowable if amended to overcome the rejection of claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶2, previously addressed herein. In view of the prior comments, claims 17 and 31 should be allowable. Claim 23 has been cancelled as redundant, based on the amendment of the remaining claims to be dependent on claim 17. Allowability of claim 17 and the claims dependent thereon (all the pending claims) is solicited.

Applicants wish to note that the characterization of “baking” as an intended use is, in Applicants’ opinion, incorrect. The term “baking” must be considered in conjunction with the entire phrase “baking mold”, defined on page 1. This phrase is not an intended use, but is a true claim limitation and describes a product, not a condition. *See* MPEP § 2111.02 ¶s 1 and 2 (2100-50, Rev. 2, May 2004) and the cases cited therein, particularly *Kropa v. Robie*, 88 USPQ 478 (CCPA 1951). The claim claims baking molds, not molds in general. Thus, for example, an elastomeric addition-curable silicone mold for casting polyurethane parts is not within the scope of the claim. The term “baking mold” breathes life and meaning into the claim.

Applicants submit that the claims are now in condition for Allowance, and respectfully request a Notice to that effect. If the Examiner believes that further discussion will advance the prosecution of the Application, he is highly encouraged to telephone Applicants' attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

Armin Fehn et al.

By 
William G. Conger
Reg. No. 31,209
Attorney/Agent for Applicant

Date: March 16, 2005

BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.
1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor
Southfield, MI 48075-1238
Phone: 248-358-4400
Fax: 248-358-3351